REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 through 19, 21, 23, 24, 27 through 34, 36 through 38, and 43 through 46 are pending, with Claims 1, 5, 6, 19, 23, 24, 33, and 43 being independent. Claims 2, 4, 20, 22, 26, 35, and 39 through 42 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 through 19, 23, 24, 33, 34, 36 through 38, and 43 have been amended. Claims 44 through 46 have been added.

Claims 1 through 6, 8 through 24, and 26 through 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,481 B1 (Heddaya, et al.) and Official Notice. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Turning first to Claims 33 and 43, Claim 33 recites, inter alia, deciding whether or not to perform transport level spoofing on a transport level connection to the apparatus in accordance with at least one of (a) an IP source address in a packet received by the apparatus and (b) an IP differentiated services field of a packet received by the apparatus. Claim 43 recites, inter alia, selectively performing transport level spoofing on a transport level connection in accordance with at least one of (a) an IP source address and (b) an IP differentiated services field.

Turning next to Claims 1 and 19, Claim 1 recites, inter alia, that the selective spoofing unit decides to perform transport level spoofing in accordance with a determination that the transport level connection is for use in sending FTP data, and the selective spoofing unit decides not to perform transport level spoofing in accordance with a determination that the transport level connection is for use in sending FTP control

- 10 -

messages. Claim 19 recites, inter alia, performing transport level spoofing on a transport level connection for use in sending FTP data, but not performing transport level spoofing on a transport level connection for use in sending FTP control messages.

Turning next to Claims 5 and 23, Claim 5 recites, inter alia, deciding whether or not to perform transport level spoofing on a transport level connection to the apparatus in accordance with plural spoofing rules, the rules being executed in an order specified by an operator of the apparatus. Claim 23 recites, inter alia, selectively performing transport level spoofing on a transport level connection in accordance with plural spoofing rules, the rules being executed in an order specified by an operator of an apparatus used to effect the method.

Turning last to Claims 6 and 24, each of those claims recites, inter alia, that the predetermined TCP port number is configurable in accordance with user input.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Heddaya, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features, as recited, inter alia, in Claims 1, 5, 6, 19, 23, 24, 33, and 43. In this regard, the taking of Official Notice in the Official Action, and the assertions without citation to a reference that various claimed features are well known or obvious, are respectfully traversed in the absence of any cited references, which references Applicants respectfully request be provided for their review. MPEP 2144.03. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited document that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from the

independent claims. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INTERVIEW

If any questions remain, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative, Craig L. Plastrik, at (301) 601-7252.

REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AMENDMENT

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached at (301) 601-7252. All

correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,254

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
RE/R11/A109
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245
(301) 601-7252

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States

Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF,

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on ___July 28___, 2004.

Ginger Fogle
Ginger Fogle

DSG

DC_MAIN 173063v1